DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 019 95 TM 007 422

AUTHOR Green, David; And Others
TITLE A Study of Dissemination and Diffusion of R&D Products in Two Teacher Training Networks: Individually Guided Education and Florida Teacher Centers.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Basic Skills Group. Learning Div.
PUB DATE Dec 76
CONTRACT 400-76-0046
NOTE 102p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Diffusion; Evaluation Methods; *Feasibility Studies; *Formative Evaluation; Higher Education; *Information Dissemination; *Networks; Participant Characteristics; Participant Involvement; Questionnaires; Teacher Centers; *Teacher Workshops; *Training Objectives
IDENTIFIERS Individually Guided Education

ABSTRACT

One-week workshops for Preparing Educational Training Constultants: Skills Training (I) (PETC-I) were given to members of two teacher training networks: the Florida Teacher Education Centers (TEC's) and the Midwest Institute for Individually Guided Instruction (IGE). PETC-I is an instructional system which can be used for trainers in existing agencies who wish to adopt this system for their inservice efforts; that is, disseminate the training to their clients. The evaluation study reported here had two main objectives--first to judge the feasibility of the strategy based upon its initial implementation; and secondly, to understand the factors influencing the feasibility of this strategy. The first objective addressed three main questions--Can the approach be generalized to other networks? What are the major needs, problems and opportunities in collaborative efforts such as these? How has the dissemination spread beyond workshop participants to network clients and schools? Answers were collected by: (1) review of written documentation; (2) interviews with workshop trainers and developers; (3) questionnaires completed by the directors of the networks; and (4) followup interviews with the directors. The second objective of this evaluation concerned the characteristics of the training and the success of the PETC-I workshop as a training entity. Data were collected from interviews with senior trainers, from a workshop evaluator-observer, and from a post-workshop questionnaire administered to the participants. Two crucial and somewhat interrelated factors determined the success of the training dissemination--network directors who had themselves participated in the PETC-I training were more likely to commit their networks to conducting their own workshops. (CP)

ED163019

TM007 422

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

2

A STUDY OF DISSEMINATION AND DIFFUSION OF R&D PRODUCTS IN TWO TEACHER TRAINING NETWORKS: INDIVIDUALLY GUIDED EDUCATION AND FLORIDA TEACHER CENTERS

David Green
Jane H. Arends
Richard I. Arends

Improving Teaching Competencies Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Portland, Oregon

November 1976

December 1976

Published by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, a private nonprofit corporation. The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-0046, with the Basic Skills Group/Learning Division of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 710 S. W. Second Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Diagrams and Tables	iv
Acknowledgments	v
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Evaluation	1
Audiences for the Evaluation	2
Report Format	2
Evaluation Design	5
Context of the evaluation	5
Description of the Dissemination Strategy	6
Goals and Objectives	7
Evaluation Questions	8
Methods of Obtaining Evaluation Information	10
Results of the Evaluation	13
Needs, Problems and Opportunities of this Dissemination Effort	13
Degree to which Dissemination Objectives were Achieved	26
Characteristics of Training	40
Summary and Discussion	49
Review of Evaluation Methods	49
Conclusions and Recommendations	50
Appendices	55

DIAGRAMS AND TABLES

Table 1:	Characteristics of PETC-I Workshop Participants	28
Table 2:	Characteristics of PETC-I Workshop Participants Course/Workshop Experience	29
Table 3:	Characteristics of Workshop Organizers (TEC Directors)	30
Table 4:	Participant Interest in Receiving Additional NWREL Training	31
Table 5:	Plans to Conduct GPS Training	35
Table 6:	Other Plans to Use PETC-I Materials - Frequency	36
Table 7:	Other Plans to Use PETC-I Materials - Specific Intentions	37
Table 8:	TEC Directors' Plans for Use of ITCP Training Systems	39
Table 9:	Participant Perception of Success of Objectives Accomplishment	44
Table 10:	Participant Perceptions of IGE Workshop	47

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report reflects the contributions of many persons besides the authors. We would like to acknowledge with appreciation their efforts.

The participants in IGE Institutes and Florida Teacher Education Centers cooperated with our data collection efforts.

William Ward and Marilyn Rieff of the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit carried out the dissemination and diffusion activities that were subject to evaluation.

Lynn O'Brien did the typing that made all drafts readable.

INTRODUCTION

This document reports the results of evaluation activities undertaken to test a particular dissemination strategy developed by the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit (FRDWU) of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (ITCP). The strategy evaluated called for providing training in Preparing Educational Training Consultants: Skills Training (I), an instructional system developed by the Improving Teaching Competencies Program, to trainers in existing agencies who wish to adapt and use this system as part of their inservice efforts. This dissemination strategy is one of several alternative strategies used by the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit to examine alternative ways of disseminating the Improving Teaching Competencies Program's instructional systems.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The primary purpose of the evaluation was to determine the feasibility of disseminating and diffusing the Improving Teaching Competencies Program's instructional systems by training members of existing networks in one or more instructional systems. This dissemination and diffusion strategy, like others tried by the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit, has specific objectives and calls for certain activities. The evaluation was to consider the strategy feasible if the activities and outcomes of trials were congruent with planned activities and expected outcomes.

In addition to determining whether the strategy is feasible, the evaluation activities were also designed to examine factors affecting feasibility and to try out procedures and instruments for testing feasibility of strategies.

The evaluation was intended to provide only preliminary and tentative evidence and judgments. It was hoped that preliminary findings could be compared to findings of future evaluations if and when the Improving Teaching Competencies Program wished more conclusive evidence or evidence comparing the efficacy of various dissemination strategies. This limitation of purposes was required because of the shortness of the time period available to the Program for implementing and evaluating this strategy.

Audiences for the Evaluation

There are three primary audiences for the information contained in this report:

1. Personnel in the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit of the Program and the marketing staff of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL)
2. Members of the National Institute of Education, funders of the Program
3. Other product developers and disseminators who may potentially use the results of the evaluation in designing dissemination/diffusion strategies for their products.

Report Format

This report is divided into three sections and includes several appendices. The first section describes the dissemination strategy being evaluated and the evaluation design employed in this investigation. Evaluation questions are identified and methods for obtaining the evaluation information also explained. The second section includes the results of the evaluation. Information collected during the course of the evaluation is displayed as answers to the evaluation questions.

The final section contains a summary of conclusions and a list of recommendations. The appendices include all instruments used in gathering data for the evaluation and documents produced by the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit in the process of implementing the dissemination strategy.

innovative approach to deciding how to proceed and what outcomes to expect.

Because of the newness of this work and the insufficiency of information bases, the evaluation was formative in nature. Its principal intent was to provide information on the requirements, problems and opportunities, of a single strategy so better planning decisions could be made in future implementation.

Description of the Dissemination Strategy

The dissemination strategy evaluated in this study belongs to the third category of dissemination and diffusion strategies outlined in the FRDWU's conceptual paper. This category requires the FRDWU to:

> Provide training with one or more intact instructional systems and technical assistance to institutions and agencies and expect those institutions and agencies to offer the systems as they would offer training using other curricula.[1]

The strategy was implemented by providing training and technical assistance to personnel of six-member centers of the Florida Teacher Education Center (TEC) network and to facilitators of the Midwest Institute for Individually Guided Instruction (IGE). One-week workshops were provided using Preparing Educational Training Consultants: Skills Training (PETC-I).[2] The workshops were held at the Curriculum and Instruction Center in Largo, Florida, from August 2-7, 1976 for TEC personnel and in Madison, Wisconsin, from October 18-22, 1976 for IGE

---

[1]Arends, Richard I., Rationale for Improving Teaching Competencies Program Dissemination/Diffusion Strategies, May 1976, p. 22.

[2]A complete description of this instructional system including intended users, main emphasis, intents (contents, main activities, provisions for use, conditions for use and cost range) is provided in Appendix A.

EVALUATION DESIGN

The purpose of this section is to describe the dissemination strategy used and to summarize the primary features of the evaluation design. The section is divided into five parts. The initial section discusses the context of the evaluation, including more information about the previously stated purpose. The second section provides a description of the dissemination strategy, its basis in the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit (FRDWU) conceptual model, its principal activities which it includes, and factors thought to influence its implementation. Section three identifies the goals and objectives of the dissemination strategy which determined the information needs of the evaluation. A list of evaluation questions addressed in the study is found in the fourth section and plans for obtaining information are described in the fifth section.

Context of the Evaluation

The evaluation had to take into account the fact that FRDWU members were starting a new kind of work. Although the dissemination strategy evaluated in this study involved activities and instructional systems that were not at all new to the FRDWU, to focus on activities in the context of how well they disseminated systems rather than how well they produced the knowledge and skills carried by the systems was a new task for FRDWU members.

The evaluation also took into account the infancy of efforts to disseminate R&D products like those of the Program. The plan of the FRDWU, calling as it did for developing a multifaceted conceptualization of dissemination and diffusion strategies, represented a relatively

facilitators. The workshops included assistance in assuming the role of trainer so participants could employ many Improving Teaching Competencies Program instructional systems in their home settings.

The decision to implement the strategy in the Florida Teacher Education Center network and the IGE Midwest Institute was based on several factors. First, people in both networks were familiar with the ITCP and its instructional systems. Members of the FRDWU had had previous working relationships with faculty in teacher training institutions in Florida and with staff of the University of Wisconsin. A number of the ITCP systems had been offered as preservice or inservice courses in both regions.

Second, people in both networks were favorably disposed toward the proposed project. Representatives of the FRDWU had made presentations at a statewide meeting of Teacher Education directors shortly after the enactment of the Teacher Education Center establishing legislation in 1975. At this meeting there had been considerable positive response to the suitability of the ITCP's instructional sytems for meeting the inservice training needs of Florida teachers. A similar presentation had been made to personnel from the IGE Institutes in November 1975 and had elicited a similar response.

Third, members of the FRDWU cited a number of convenience factors such as the fact that the project did not require much preparation time because no additional development was needed and no additional staff had to be hired.

Goals and Objectives

Two major objectives were proposed for the TEC and IGE interventions and guided the development of the evaluation questions and methodology.

1. Obtain greater understanding of the feasibility of this strategy as a means of disseminating ITCP instructional systems. As a result of these activities, the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit will be able to determine the following:

   a. Whether the approach appears generalizable to other networks

   b. The major needs, problems and opportunities in collaborative efforts such as these

   c. Whether the dissemination objectives have been achieved or the degree to which this strategy leads to the following:

      1. Knowledge of available products by participants
      2. Spread of knowledge of products from participants to others
      3. Use of products in TEC and IGE schools as a direct or indirect result of participant involvement in these sessions
      4. Degree to which product use is viewed as helpful to solving problems in TEC and IGE schools
      5. Further training in package use because strategy includes process of training "trainers" (multiplier effect)
      6. Further training by participants in packages other than those used in training sessions

2. Obtain greater understanding of the variables which may affect the feasibility of this strategy as a means of disseminating ITCP instructional systems. As a result of these activities, the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit will have some indication of the degree to which the following classes of variables appear to be important considerations:

   a. Characteristics of participants

   b. Characteristics of schools

   c. Characteristics of the instructional system used

   d. Characteristics of the actual training received

Evaluation Questions

Listed below are the evaluation questions which formed the basis for the evaluation activities and results reported in this document. They are sorted into two major categories to correspond to the two categories of objectives described previously. In addition, evaluation

questions relating to each sub-objective are grouped together, thereby clarifying the relationship between the objectives and questions to be addressed.

1. Questions relating to the feasibility of this strategy as a means of disseminating ITCP instructional systems.

   b. What are the major needs, problems and opportunities in collaborative efforts such as these?

      1. What are the antecedents and transactions involved in developing and implementing these collaborative relationships?

      2. What factors inhibit collaborative efforts such as these?

      3. What are the crucial elements of a successful collaboration effort of this nature?

      4. What are the "spin offs" from these efforts?

      5. To what degree would personnel from both institutions actively seek other collaborative arrangements?

      6. To what degree are prior working relationships a necessary ingredient to entry into networks?

      7. What are the characteristics of participants and organizers?

---

[3]In the evaluation design created at the outset of this study (Reinhard, 1976), there were enumerated several constraints which impinged on the design. One of these constraints that continued to make its presence felt all along was the extremely short time-space between implementation of the strategy in the PETC-I training in August (for TEC) and October (for IGE) and the end of the ITCP funding cycle, November 30, 1976. This time constraint severely restricted the ability to detect actual achievement of dissemination/diffusion objectives. Consequently, evaluation activities were limited to those objectives for which time permitted the collection of usable data. Evaluation questions addressing sub-objective "a" under the first category of objectives and sub-objectives "a", "b" and "c" for the second category are not included here since the activities directed toward evaluating these dissemination objectives could not occur in the time available between the implementation of the dissemination strategy and the deadline for this technical report.

c. Were the dissemination objectives achieved?

8. To what degree are participants more knowledgeable about ITCP products as a result of their involvement?

9. To what degree is there greater use of ITCP products in TEC and IGE schools which can be traced to involvement in these sessions either directly or indirectly?

10. To what degree did persons trained train others?

11. To what degree did training in these products lead to future training by same participants in other products?

12. To what degree are products sold?

2. Questions relating to the understanding of the variables which affect feasibility of strategy

d. Characteristics of the actual training received

13. What is the rationale behind training format, selection of products used, and time allocation?

14. To what degree are the objectives for the sessions accomplished?

15. To what degree are the sessions well organized and delivery effective?

16. To what degree are accommodations conducive to effective training?

Methods of Obtaining Evaluation Information

To collect the needed information, three interrelated investigations were proposed in the original evaluation design (Reinhard, 1976). Because of time constraints, only two of these studies were pursued so their results can be reported in this document. A description of these two investigations follows with a discussion of the purposes of the activities and identification of the different data collection methods used. Further descriptions of instrumentation and data collection methods are included in the second section of this report.

The first study was designed to provide information on the feasibility of the strategy based upon initial implementation efforts. Specifically, one purpose of this investigation was to describe and make judgments regarding the needs, problems and opportunities of collaborative efforts such as these. Descriptions and judgments regarding needs, problems, and opportunities were obtained by the following means: (1) review of written documentation, (2) informal interviews with FRDWU staff, (3) a questionnaire for the TEC and IGE directors who organized the training, and (4) a follow-up interview of TEC and IGE directors.

A second purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which short-term dissemination objectives were achieved. One assessment point occurred immediately following workshops when participants were asked about their intentions to train others, to participate in additional training, etc. A second assessment point occurred just prior to the writing of this report by means of a follow-up interview with workshop participants from the TEC; no follow-up was possible with IGE participants because of the lateness of the training in relation to the end of the funding cycle. In addition, informal interviews with the FRDWU staff just prior to the writing of the report were used to discover additional contacts and on-going relationships with both TEC and IGE personnel.

The second and third studies were short- and long-term studies focusing on understanding the factors that influence feasibility. Of the four categories of factors which were identified as possibly influencing the degree to which the dissemination objectives were achieved, i.e., participants themselves, the schools, the instructional systems, and the actual training received, only the latter factor was

evaluated in the short-term study. The long-term study of the other three factors was not undertaken due to the time constraints previously mentioned. The only purpose of the short-term study was to determine if the training was effective. Two means of data collection fed into this process: (1) an evaluator-observer was present at training sessions and made judgments as to the overall quality and the degree of deviation from established procedures, and (2) a participant questionnaire requested perceptions of quality.

RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of this section is to present information that was collected in this evaluation study and to relate the information to evaluation questions that guided the study. The section is divided into two major parts based on the categories of the evaluation questions posed earlier: (a) questions related to feasibility of the strategy that are further divided into subcategories of questions relating to the degree to which dissemination objectives were achieved; and (b) questions relating to variables which may have affected feasibility.

Needs, Problems and Opportunities of The Dissemination Effort

Evaluation questions, methods, and results pertaining to needs, problems and opportunities in disseminating ITCP instructional systems through extant teacher training networks appear in this section.

Methods of Tracing History. One evaluation question asked for the history of the relationship between the ITCP and the networks:

> What are the antecedents and transactions involved in developing and implementing these collaborative relationships?

The resource for this information was the staff of the FRDWU. The means of data collection were (a) an Activity Report Form which FRDWU staff completed after each interaction with relevant actors in the dissemination effort and (b) an interview with FRDWU staff. The Activity Report Form (Appendix A) was a one-page instrument to organize significant information about any interaction. It asked for such information as who participated, the purpose of the interaction and the FRDWU's preparation for it, what occurred during the interaction and what plans for future action were developed. The interview was informal and no instrumentation exists.

Results: Florida Teacher Education Center's History with FRDWU. The 1975 Florida legislature passed a bill which provided that $5 per public school student be set aside to support a statewide network of Teacher Education Centers (TEC). The purpose of TECs was to provide inservice training to the public school personnel in their areas of the state. A portion of this fund was allocated to several state universities to provide services to geographical subgroupings of TECs.

The Improving Teaching Competencies Program's relationship with the TECs began in June of 1975 when the TECs invited Frank Sobol, a project officer at the National Institute of Education (NIE), to attend a statewide meeting of TEC directors and talk with them about NIE and how some of the products of NIE might be of service to the TECs. Sobol asked the coordinator of the FRDWU to present the ITCP's instructional systems at the meeting. Several informal conversations with individual TEC directors followed and one of these directors eventually involved his TEC in the project evaluated here.

During the winter of 1975-76, the FRDWU decided to recruit several TECs in one part of Florida for this study. Phone calls to eight TEC directors in late February were followed by face-to-face visits in March. Agreements reached about ITCP and TEC responsibilities were summarized in a followup letter from the FRDWU coordinator to all directors. (See Appendix B for the letter and subsequent correspondence.) Also at the meeting, the director of the TEC in Largo, Florida offered to host the workshop.

At this point an additional party, the College of Education at the University of South Florida (USF), became involved as the state university responsible for providing services and resources for six of the eight TECs. In late March the Dean of USF's College of Education

called the FRDWU [illegible] to discuss a possible visit to NWREL and to indicat[illegible] [illegible]come[illegible] his staff might be able to attend th[illegible]ima on, the Dean was included in all inter[illegible] and the TEC directors.

The [illegible] directors occurred in late April when the FRDWU coordinator confirmed the directors' commitment to the study and checked on their progress in recruiting participants. Two directors, both from TECs geographically distant from the intended workshop site, dropped out of the study. The FRDWU coordinator also arranged to send copies of the evaluation design to the six remaining directors, to be in phone contact with them to receive their feedback on the design, and to contact the USF Dean by phone about this meeting.

Followup letters and phone calls in June about the evaluation design revealed that the six TEC directors were satisfied with the design and had no recommendations for alteration. The USF Dean said he would mail his ideas, but apparently never did so.

In mid-July, participant lists were received from four of the TEC directors and letters containing workshop information (Appendix B) sent to these participants. A copy of the participant lists was sent to the director of the Largo TEC and he sent information to the participants concerning lodging in the area and directions to the workshop site. Staff of the FRDWU made several telephone calls to the remaining directors during the latter part of July, but were unable to obtain participant lists prior to the start of training.

On July 16th, the FRDWU coordinator met with the director of the TEC in Largo to make a final check of the training facilities and to arrange for the shipment of training materials to be received. Friday

before the Monday morning workshop started, to set up for the workshop's first day. On July 28, a telephone call was made to the Largo TEC directory by the FRDWU staff to confirm the arrival of the training materials at the training site. The FRDWU senior trainer arrived in Largo on the 30th to prepare the training facilities for the first day's activities. That concluded all transactions involved in developing the collaborative relationship that resulted in the implementation of the PETC-I training and its encompassing dissemination strategy.

Results: IGE Institute's History with FRDWU. NWREL began its collaborative effort with the Wisconsin R&D Center in 1970 when the directors of the two institutions plus the directors of CEMREL and the FarWest Laboratory formed an informal consortium to effectively and efficiently reach potential users of R&D products. All consortium members had commercially available products, were highly committed to a collaborative venture, and were willing to financially support this effort. Connections between the Wisconsin Center and the ITCP grew somewhat closer in 1972 when an article on the ITCP instructional systems appeared in a Wisconsin newsletter. Generally, however, all interactions remained occasional and informal as federal funds to support close collaboration were never found.

During the fall of 1975 the FRDWU decided to attempt to link with the IGE network for this study. The FRDWU staff contacted Wisconsin's IGE dissemination staff and set up a meeting at which IGE staff suggested involving IGE Institutes in Florida, Wisconsin, California, and Connecticut. The FRDWU staff met with representatives of the four in November 1975 and conducted a session on teambuilding. All present responded favorably to the proposed study and expressed interest in being involved.

At the same time the ITCP submitted a scope of work to NIE for the funding of this study. The money awarded by NIE was less than requested and the study had to be narrowed to work with one Institute. The decision was made to work with the Wisconsin IGE Institute and plans began.

In February 1976 the directors of the IGE Institute met at NWREL with FRDWU staff and all agreed to recruit participants from IGE schools for a three week workshop to be held during the summer. The workshop was to include training in Interpersonal Communications (IPC), PETC-I/ Group Process Skills (GPS), and a series of experiences designed to acquaint participants with other ITCP products and to assist them in making adaptations and modifications of IPC and GPS in IGE schools. Options to participate in one, two, or all three weeks of the training would be available.

Between April and the middle of September, a series of phone calls and letters recorded in Activity Report Forms tell a story of delays, problems recruiting participants, replanning to reduce the workshop to one week, more postponements and more replanning. The final plan for one-week workshop for 15-20 participants in mid-October was finally set in place in mid-September.

Methods of Tracing Variables that Influenced Relationships. Two evaluation questions were concerned with identifying some of the variables that influenced the relationship between the FRDWU and the networks.

> What factors inhibit collaborative efforts such as these?
>
> What are the crucial elements of a successful collaboration effort of this nature?

The first source of information was the staff of the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit with whom interviews were conducted using the two evaluation questions as the basis for discussion. The other

information source were the six TEC directors and two directors of the IGE Institute in Wisconsin and the USF Dean.

A nine-item interview schedule, The Workshop Coordinator Interview Guide, (Appendix C) was developed for use with the TEC and IGE directors. One of the interview questions was:

> Thinking back on the evolution of your relationship with NWREL in preparation for this PETC-I workshop what do you see as being helpful factors in building this relationship? Hindering, inhibiting factors?

A tally was made of the factors identified by six respondents from TEC and two from IGE.

Results: Variables Influencing TEC-FRDWU Relationship. In response to the question on inhibiting factors, the FRDWU staff identified three factors that were not mentioned by the four TEC directors who named factors. One factor was peculiar to the nature of a relationship with a network and thus working with a multi-party client. The logistics involved in scheduling a meeting with seven different parties posed a greater problem than if the relationship had been between two individual parties. Also seen as a hindering factor was that the two parties had differing goals to be realized by this relationship: the ITCP wanted to implement a dissemination strategy and collect information for its evaluation while the TEC directors' objective was to gain an additional resource for their inservice training programs. This factor is interrelated with a third factor involving the importance the TEC directors placed on this relationship and its potential. It is possible that the varying degrees of responsible recruiting participants for the workshop was an indicator of the priority each director gave to this project.

Two other factors considered by the FRDWU were each mentioned

by two of the Florida respondents. One of these was the geographical distance between the TEC directors in Florida and the FRDWU in Oregon. This distance limited face-to-face contact and the spread of time zones hampered communications by decreasing the number of business hours in common to both parties. The second factor was the timing of the workshops such that the majority of the preparation took place during the summer vacation period for public school personnel.*

One TEC director brought up two inhibiting factors not mentioned by any of the other respondents. One of these was that the FRDWU proposal to train an ITCP system created a conflict between the FRDWU and the offerings of the University of South Florida and the University of Florida for summer training workshops in ITCP systems. A second factor was that the initial FRDWU proposal did not identify a definite training package to be offered. This was an inconvenience for this director since his willingness to be involved was dependent on which training system could offer the most to his TEC.

In response to the question on helping factors in this relationship, the FRDWU staff enumerated several characteristics of a general nature, applicable to any interpersonal and workshop relationship. They identified such conditions and behaviors as honesty and integrity, leveling with people from the start, keeping surprises to a minimum, keeping communication channels open, following through on commitments, setting appropriate expectations and reaching shared understandings of these expectations.

Peculiar to this particular relationship with the TECs, the staff mentioned three factors. One was the fine reputation and credibility

---

*One person emphasized that the summer of 1976 was even more difficult than other summers because of an increase in out-of-town vacationing for the Bicentennial.

of NWREL and its products. Another factor was the interest shown by the FRDWU staff in the goals of the TECs for this endeavor and the aid given to the directors in setting realistic goals. A final helping factor was the face-to-face contact during the relationship. This lessened the effect of dealing mainly with a disembodied voice over the telephone line. Too, the fact that FRDWU staff would come all the way across the country was an expression of interest and commitment on their part.

This last factor, the personal contact, was affirmed by five of the six TEC directors. One of the directors touched on several of the other factors mentioned above by mentioning "availability; willingness to answer questions, be specific, and to learn about the local situation." The sixth TEC director considered the personalities of the ITCP staff involved with the installation and training of the workshop to be a helpful factor. He also thought that the requirement that the TECs sponsor a GPS workshop this fall after the PETC-I training helped to strengthen his commitment to the relationship.

Results: Variables Influencing IGE-FRDWU Relationship. Both directors reported that the cooperation extended by NWREL personnel had been excellent since they were prompt in responding to questions and sending materials. Both mentioned that the face-to-face meeting held in March of 1976 was helpful for clarifying expectations and reaching agreements.

When probed for unhelpful factors, neither mentioned any factors associated with NWREL although both reported their frustration at not being able to recruit sufficient participants for the planned summer event. All agreed that the Bicentennial summer had been a particularly rough time to schedule workshops of any kind.

Methods for Determining Spinoffs. Along with the intended outcomes of this dissemination strategy, the evaluation was interested in what by-products might result from the ITCP's relationship with the TECs. Given the extremely short period of time since the implementation of this dissemination strategy, the development of by-products from the workshops is not yet apparent. The responses to the following evaluation question were thus speculative.

What are the "spinoffs" from these efforts?

Information relating to this question was gathered from informal interviews with the FRDWU staff. There was no instrument developed for the data collection for this item and the interviews concerned spinoffs for the TECs only.

Results About Spinoffs for TECs. The FRDWU staff identified spinoffs relating to inter-TEC relationships and relating to the future use of ITCP products in Florida.

Regarding inter-TEC relationships, it was the perception of the FRDWU staff that the TECs had been operating almost exclusively on a basis independently of each other prior to the workshop. During the workshop, however, a great deal of consideration was given to the possibilities of inter-TEC training teams. In fact, one of the three GPS workshops that had been definitely scheduled at the time of this writing involved a training team trio from two TECs and the USF. One possible spin-off was the building of interdependent and collaborative relationships among the TECs.

A spinoff relating to the future dissemination of ITCP products in Florida resulted from the fact that the ITCP now has direct contact with people in the schools rather than only indirect contact because of relations with agencies providing inservice.

Methods for Determining Satisfaction. One question was asked as an indicator of how satisfying this collaborative effort had been for the parties involved.

> To what degree would personnel from both institutions actively seek other collaborative arrangements?

Again, information relating to this question was gained through informal interviews with the staff of the FRDWU and from structured interviews with the TEC and IGE directors. The schedule used for interviews with the TEC and IGE directors included this question:

> Would you actively seek other collaborative arrangements such as the one you had with NWREL, i.e. an arrangement in which you aid an outside organization in providing new resources for your TEC program?

Results: TEC Satisfaction. There was a unanimous favorable response from FRDWU staff, the six Florida directors and the USF Dean. The FRDWU staff reported excitement at working with a unique type of client, several agencies that had not previously worked together. The TEC directors tended to comment that this type of arrangement was a common one for them which they would continue to pursue for the benefits derived by their TECs.

Results: IGE Satisfaction. There was also a unanimous positive response from the IGE Directors. Unlike the TEC Directors, IGE personnel reported that this had been really their first successful collaborative arrangement. They had previously tried to work out arrangements with another R&D Laboratory but had not been able to obtain materials that were owned by a publishing company. Both Directors reported they would seek additional aid from NWREL and other agencies who could provide resources in similar ways.

Methods to Ascertain Importance of Prior Relationship. One evaluation question was concerned with how influential prior working relationships had been to the success of the dissemination venture.

> To what degree are prior working relationships a necessary ingredient to entry into networks?

Interviews with the FRDWU staff provided the information related to this evaluation question. There was no structured instrument for this purpose.

Results: Importance of Prior FRDWU-TEC Relationship. Prior to making entry into the Florida TEC network, the ITCP had working relationships with the Colleges of Education at the University of Florida (UF) in Gainesville and the University of South Florida (USF) in Tampa. Of particular importance, according to FRDWU staff, were relationships with the Director of Curriculum and Instruction at UF, a man who was ITCP's regional representative in the southeastern United States. This man, an advocate of Teacher Education Center legislation, was perceived as a key influential person with the Florida educational system was very instrumental in establishing credibility with the TEC personnel and in obtaining their favorable responses to participating in this study at the outset.

According to staff of the FRDWU, their relationship with USF was newer and less important an influence on the TEC directors. However, since six of the fourteen Florida TEC's were in the USF area, it is possible that the ITCP's association with the USF was a factor in Sobol's early invitation for the FRDWU's coordinator to make a presentation at the June 1975 meeting of TEC directors.

Results: Importance of Prior FRDWU-IGE Relationship. The staff of the Field Relations and Dissemination work unit also reported that prior

relationship with IGE personnel was important in making entry into the IGE training network. Critical in their perceptions were the previously-described presentations to IGE institute directors and early face-to-face meetings with directors of the Wisconsin Institute.

Methods of Learning About Participants. One evaluation question was aimed at obtaining demographic information about the workshop participants and the TEC directors.

> What are the characteristics of participants and organizers?

Information was obtained on participant and organizer characteristics through the use of two paper and pencil questionnaires. The Participant Background Information Sheet was administered on the morning of the first day of training for TEC and IGE participants. A Workshop Organizer Questionnaire, containing a small number of questions about demographic information, was administered directly to those TEC and IGE directors who were participating in the workshop and mailed to those TEC directors who were not present.

The Participant Background Information Sheet (Appendix B) obtained information on sex, age, current job position, years educational work experience, educational background, prior workshop experience, and reasons for attendance. Three forms of the Sheet were used and random distribution applied when determining which participants would have which form.

The Workshop Organizer Questionnaire contained an initial section of demographic questions to obtain information from the TEC directors on their sex, current job position, years overall educational work experience and years experience in current position. The entire Organizer Questionnaire can be found in Appendix E.

Results: TEC Participants. The information obtained from the

Participant Background Information Sheet is presented in Tables 1 and 2. Twenty-two educators completed PETC-I training for TEC personnel, two-thirds of whom were women. More than half of the participants were in the 31-40 and over 50 age categories. The job classification with the greatest representation (32%) was curriculum specialists at a local or school level. The two occupations next most often identified were program coordinators at a county or district level and teachers with nearly 25% of the participants falling into each of these categories. Other job classifications represented by the participants included district consultant, principal, university professor and school counselor. Half of the trainees had 13 or more years of educational work experience and two-thirds of the participants had master's degrees. Another 20% had their doctorates. To the question concerning their motivation for attending the PETC-I training, the greatest number of responses were in the areas perceiving the training as relevant to their work situation (60%) or being of special personal interest (53%). Somewhat less often mentioned were the potential for obtaining skills for helping groups and having a superior in the school suggest attendance; an outcome of personal growth as a group member was also mentioned. The types of prior workshop training and coursework most often experienced by the participants were in the areas of interpersonal communications and human relations. Also receiving multiple responses were experiences in group dynamics and interaction analysis. Four of the fourteen respondents to this question had no prior experience in any of the content areas inquired about. The majority of the training experiences took the form of university coursework over the period of a semester or more. All participants' training in interpersonal communications, interaction analysis and problem solving had taken place during the

past two years while learning experiences in the other areas had been less recent.

The characteristics of the workshop organizers, presented in Table 3, show them to be quite a homogeneous group. All seven respondents were male. All had considerable work experience in education with six of the respondents being evenly divided between the ranges of 11-20 years and 21-30 years; the seventh member had given over 30 years to his educational career. All were relatively new to their present positions with over half (57%) having less than four years experience and only one person being more than six years at his present job. With one exception, the Dean of USF's College of Education, all respondents were directors of their area's Teacher Education Center.

Results: IGE Participants. Twelve educators participated in PETC-I training for IGE personnel. Participants were predominately male, but they varied greatly in age and work experience. Several education positions were represented, including principals and team leaders from the IGE schools. The majority of participants, however, was associated with college and universities, either as faculty or advanced graduate students. The two IGE coordinators were on the staff at the University of Wisconsin.

Degree to Which Dissemination Objectives Were Achieved

Evaluation questions, methods and results pertaining to attainment of dissemination objectives appear in this section.

Methods to Track Dissemination of Other ITCP Systems to Participants. Two of the questions in the evaluation design refer to the objectives of the dissemination strategy to deliver other ITCP training systems through the Florida TEC and IGE networks.

To what degree are participants more knowledgeable about Lab products as a result of this involvement?

To what degree did training in (PETC-I) lead to future training by same participants in other products?

Information pertaining to these questions was obtained through the use of a Post Session Questionnaire, administered to all workshop participants following the final PETC-I training session. One section of this questionnaire dealt with participants' plans for using PETC-I training and receiving further training. Due to the short span of time between the conclusion of the PETC-I training and the writing of this report, data relating to the second evaluation question above is couched in terms of intents to receive further training rather than actual further training received.

All three forms of the Post Session Questionnaire included the following item:

Would you like to receive additional training in other NWREL workshops?

_____yes If yes, which ones?_____

_____no

A tabulation of the positive and negative responses and of the number of respondents indicating each NWREL workshop that was identified appears in Table 4.

During the workshops, brochures describing eight ITCP instructional systems (including PETC-I) were given to participants. These were distributed on the last day of the training along with a verbal description of two additional systems not included in the brochure. Although no specific measure was taken of the participants' knowledge of Lab products prior to the workshops and the response to receiving training in some of these systems was minimal, it is apparent that information about the range

TABLE 1

Characteristics of PETC-I Workshop Participants

Item	TEC Frequency	TEC Percent	IGE Frequency	IGE Percent
Sex TEC N=22 IGE N=12				
Male	8	36	9	75
Female	14	64	3	25
Age TEC N=22 IGE N=12				
Under 30	3	14	4	33
31-40	7	32	4	33
41-50	5	23	4	33
Over 50	7	32		
Current Occupation TEC N=22 IGE N=12				
Program Coordinator (district)	5	23	1	8
Consultant (district)	2	9	1	8
Principal	1	5	3	25
Curriculum Specialist or Coordinator	7	32	0	0
Counselor	1	5	0	0
Teacher/Unit Leader	5	32	1	8
University Professor	1	5	4	33
Graduate Student	0	0	2	17
Work Experience TEC N=14 IGE N=12				
1-4 years	1	7	0	0
5-8 years	4	29	5	42
9-12 years	2	14	0	0
13-20 years	3	21	5	42
Over 20 years	4	29	2	16
Educational Background TEC N=15 IGE N=6				
Bachelors Degree	1	7	0	0
Bachelors plus Graduate Degree	1	7	2	33
Masters Degree	10	66	2	33
Doctorate Degree	3	20	2	33
Reasons for Attendance TEC N=15 IGE N=6				
Relevance to work situation	9	60	3	50
Special interest to topic	8	53	2	33
Obtain skills for helping groups	6	40	3	50
Superior suggested attendance	5	33	1	16
Improve self as a group member	2	13	2	33
Friend Recommended			3	50

*The number of responses is greater than the number of respondents since the question allowed more than one response.

TABLE 2

Characteristics of PETC-I Workshop Participants Course/Workshop Experience

Course or Workshop Description	TEC N=14 IGE N=6	Frequency TEC	IGE	2-5 days TEC	IGE	5-7 days TEC	IGE	Semester of Longer TEC	IGE	Before 1973 TEC	IGE	1973 TEC	IGE	1974 TEC	IGE	1975 TEC	IGE	1976 TEC	IGE
Interpersonal Communications and Influence		6	1	2	1	3		1								2	1	4	
Problem Solving		1	1		1			1						1		1			
Group Dynamics		3	2		2			3		3				2					
Human Relations		5		2		1		2		4		1							
Sensitivity Training		1						1				1							
Encounter Groups																			
Interaction Analysis		3						3								2		1	
Other		2	2					2	2					2			2		
No Experience		4	2																

TABLE 3

Characteristics of Workshop Organizers (TEC Directors)

Item (TEC N=7, IGE N=2)	TEC Frequency	TEC Percent	IGE Frequency	IGE Percent
Sex				
Male	7	100	2	100
Female	0	0	0	0
Overall Years Work Experience				
Under 11	0	0	1	50
11-20	3	43	0	0
21-30	3	43	1	50
Over 30	1	14	0	0
Current Job Position*				
Director, TEC and Staff Development	6	86	0	0
Director, Curriculum and Instruction	1	14	0	0
Dean of University, School of Education	1	14	0	0
University Staff			2	100
Years in Present Position				
1-3	4	57	1	50
4-6	2	29	0	0
7-10	1	14	1	50
Over 10	0	0	0	0

*There are more responses than respondents since one TEC director also holds the position of Director of Curriculum and Instruction.

Table 4

Participant Interest in Receiving Additional NWREL Training

Item	TEC N=22 IGE N=12	TEC Frequency	TEC Percent	IGE Frequency	IGE Percent
Would you like to receive additional training in other NWREL workshops?					
Yes		19	86	11	92
No		0	0	0	0
N/A		3	14	1	8
If yes, which ones?					
Interpersonal Communications (IPC)		13	59	4	33
Research Utilizing Problem Solving (RUPS)		13	59	3	25
Preparing Educational Training Consultants II (PETC-II)		10	45	8	66
Preparing Educational Training Consultants III (PETC-III)		8	36	4	33
Interpersonal Influence (INF)		8	36	4	33
Systematic and Objective Analysis of Instruction (SOAI)		3	14	2	17
Facilitating Inquiry in the Classroom		3	14	2	17
Development of Higher Level Thinking Abilities (HLTA)		3	14	1	8
Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving (SC&NPS)		2	9	4	33

of training products available from the ITCP was communicated to the participants in this workshop.

Results: Future Dissemination of ITCP Systems to TEC Participants. Nineteen of the 22 participants (86 percent) indicated they wished to receive further training in NWREL workshops. There were no negative responses although three participants made no response. The systems in which the greatest interest was shown were Interpersonal Communications (59 percent), Research Utilizing Problem Solving (59 percent), Preparing Educational Training Consultants-II: Consulting (45 percent), Interpersonal Influence (36 percent) and Preparing Educational Training Consultants-III: Organization Development (36 percent). There was considerably less interest shown in the remaining training programs with only two (9 percent) of the three (14 percent) respondents indicating a desire for training in them.

Results: Future Dissemination of ITCP Systems to IGE Participants. Eleven of the 12 IGE participants reported a desire to receive additional training in the ITCP's instructional systems. The largest number evidenced interest in Preparing Educational Training Consultants-II: Consulting. With the exception of showing more interest in the system on Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving, IGE participants were quite similar to their TEC counterparts.

Methods to Investigate Dissemination Beyond Participants. Two evaluation questions were concerned with GPS training to be provided by the PETC-I trainees and the use of this and other ITCP instructional systems in the public schools:

> To what degree is there greater use of Lab products in schools which can be traced to participant involvement in these sessions?
>
> To what degree did the participants train others?

Information pertaining to the first evaluation question above was obtained from two sources: (a) the TEC and IGE workshop participants, and (b) the TEC directors. From the workshop participants data was collected in three ways:

1. Training team plans developed during the last day of training
2. A question on the Post Session Questionnaire inquiring about their plans to give training in the future
3. A follow-up interview with workshop participants just prior to the writing of the report

The Workshop Coordinator Interview Guide was used to gather information from the TEC directors on their further plans to use NWREL products. Again, as previously explained, the data that has been collected is, for the most part, indications of intended or predicted rather than actual use.

Towards the end of the PETC-I training, training teams from each TEC developed plans for training a GPS workshop during the fall of 1976. These plans were recorded on NCR paper and represent part of the data presented in Table 5.

A Participant Interview Guide was developed to gain follow-up data about the implementation of GPS training plans by workshop participants. The interview asked if they had completed their GPS workshop, when they planned to do their GPS training if they had not yet done so and what other uses they were making of their PETC-I materials. One member of each training team was interviewed just prior to the writing of this report. The results of this interview are displayed in Table 5. A copy of this interview schedule can be found in Appendix F.

The Post Session Questionnaire contained one question relating to future use of their PETC-I training:

In addition to the GPS session that will follow from this

workshop, do you intend to use the workshop materials to train others?

_____Yes If yes, please explain:_____

_____

_____No _____

Positive and negative responses were tabulated and data are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

The Workshop Coordinator Interview Guide asked the TEC directors what plans they had made to set up ITCP workshops beyond the GPS workshop they were committed to presenting. These data are presented in Table 8.

Data speaking to the second evaluation question was obtained from the workshop participants' training team plans and from the follow-up telephone interviews using the Participant Interview Guide.

Results: Dissemination Beyond Participants for TEC. Training teams from five of the six Teacher Education Centers chose to develop plans for delivering a GPS workshop in their area. As can be seen in the data presented in Table 5, three of the five plans bore fruit, with some 45-49 educators being exposed to this ITCP training system. The other two training teams awaited some form of action from their TEC directors at the time this report was written.

The five teams that identified a target group to receive the GPS training chose intact groups in their school systems. In three instances, a district level group was targeted. Two of these district groups were the TEC councils which are the decision-making bodies on matters of staff development and inservice training and would be an influencing factor in the further use of ITCP training systems in their area. It should be noted also that in two of the three GPS workshops that were presented, the TEC director had participated in the PETC-I training whereas in the

TABLE 5

PLANS TO CONDUCT GPS TRAINING[a]

Team	Date Training to Begin	Group To Receive GPS Training	GPS Participants	Trainers from Host TEC	Trainers from Other TEC's	TEC Director Participated in PETC-I Training	Form of Delivery	Obstacles to Carrying Out GPS Plans
A	10/4/76	TEC Council	11	4	NA	Yes	4½ continuous days training drawing on exercises from GPS, IPC, RUPS, INF	NA
B	(9/76)	District Curriculum Coordinators/ Directors	(18-30)	(4)	NA	No	(———)	TEC Director has not made decision on timing
C	(Winter 1977)	(Middle School Faculty)	(———)	(1)	(———)	No	(———)	Lack of permanent TEC Director to oversee workshop coordination; only one person from this TEC received training and has increased job demands this year
D	(10/12/76)	(A number of possibilities; undecided)	(———)	(3-6)	(1)	No	(———)	Need to wait for results of TEC needs assessment before TEC Director will release money
E	10/21/76	TEC Council	(17-20)	1	2	Yes	3-day modified GPS workshop with ongoing skills exercises through the year	NA
F	10/7/76	Middle School Faculty	(17-18)	1	1	No	One evening session a week for ten weeks	NA

[a]There are six teams represented in the table since one TEC had two training teams which made joint plans at the PETC-I training, but have acted on those plans as separate teams. Teams D and F are from the same TEC. The USF faculty member did not create plans of his own since he meant to serve as a training resource for the TEC training teams.

( ) Entries presented in parentheses represent information from the planning documents developed during the PETC-I training in August 1976.

Entries without parentheses are information from followup interviews which took place the last week of September 1976.

(———) Indicates no information was included in group plans on this item.

NA Not Applicable

three TEC's where training plans have not--at the date of this report--been realized, the TEC directors were not PETC-I participants. This evidence suggests that the success of a dissemination strategy such as the one used in the Florida TEC network may depend upon having key people participate fully in the implementation of that strategy.

Table 6

Other Plans to Use PETC-I Materials - Frequency

Item N=22	Frequency	Percent
In addition to the GPS session that will follow from this workshop, do you intend to use the workshop materials to train others?		
Yes	18	82
No	2	9
N/A	2	9

In addition to creating plans for training a GPS workshop, the PETC-I participants were asked if they planned to use the workshop materials to train in other situations. Eighty-two (82) percent of the participants indicated an intent to continue using the training materials.

A more detailed indicator of intent, found in the data in Table 7, is that 55 percent of the responses identified a specific target group with which the respondent intended to work. The other 45 percent of the affirmative responses were more passive in the sense that the respondent would wait until asked.

In the followup interview, six workshop participants* were asked whether they had used the PETC-I materials for any other purpose than

*A 27 percent sample comprised of one member from each training team and the USF faculty member.

Table 7

Other Plans to Use PETC-I Materials - Specific Intentions

	Example of intended uses	Frequency
Specific responses:*	Present GPS workshop to:	
N=10	Reading center groups	2
	Instructional teams	2
	Group facilitator triads in elementary schools	1
	Own school faculty	2
	TEC council	1
	County math teachers	1
	Use GPS materials in:	
	Adult communication classes	1
	Transactional analysis courses	1
	In own consulting work	1
General responses:		
N=8	Provide training if requested by TEC director	5
	Provide training to any group that requests it	3

*There are more responses than respondents because some respondents identified more than one target group.

the GPS workshop they were planning to train. Only two of the six respondents indicated that they had used or were about to use the materials. Both intended to make piecemeal use of the GPS skills exercises, one person in on-going training of team leaders in her school and the USF professor in a supervision course at the university.

One final source of information on intended use of ITCP materials in TEC schools was the TEC directors. Three of the five directors who approved PETC-I skills trainer teams in their TEC had identified specific plans for use of ITCP materials. Director A, who had received training himself in three ITCP programs and had more in-house ITCP training resources than any other TEC, had implemented a program using four ITCP systems. Director B, although he had not yet delivered the initial GPS workshop, had plans to follow that training with several other GPS workshops and other ITCP systems as resources were available. Director E's plans were similar to those of Director B; he had scheduled a RUPS workshop to follow GPS.

At the conclusion of the PETC-I training, nineteen of the twenty-two participants had intentions of conducting GPS workshops in their TEC area. As is evident in Table 5, there were nine trainers involved in the three GPS workshops that definitely had been scheduled. However, since two of the nine trainers were conducting a GPS workshop both in their own area and as part of another TEC's training team, only seven (32 percent) of the PETC-I skills trainers had conducted a GPS workshop by the end of October 1976. There were indications that another seven, from Teams B and D, were to have conducted a GPS workshop by the end of fall term 1976.

Table 8

TEC Directors' Plans for Use of ITCP Training Systems

TEC Director*	Plans
A	Using previously trained TEC personnel, he will offer IPC, INF, RUPS and GPS throughout the TEC area during the 1976-77 school year to interested intact faculty groups.
B	He will attempt to install GPS workshops with the curriculum coordinator groups in the five smaller counties served by his TEC.
C	He has ongoing relationship with FRDWU coordinator and will attempt to install at least one ITCP system in his TEC area.
D,F	None
E	He has ongoing relationship with the FRDWU coordinator and will offer RUPS in spring/summer 1977 as perhaps a first step in installing other ITCP systems in his area.

*The letter identifiers match with the letter identifiers of the GPS training teams in Table 5.

Results: Dissemination Beyond Participants for IGE. Participants in the IGE workshop were asked only one question regarding planned subsequent use. The question on the questionnaire read:

How do you intend to use PETC-I training:

_____to conduct a GPS workshop

_____other

Nine of the 12 participants reported plans to conduct a GPS workshop. Other planned uses reported included: conduct PETC-I workshop, modify activities and use with IGE faculties, use specific exercises with own staff, integrate strategies and materials with IGE training and implementation, and integrate basic model into a course at the University of Wisconsin. Actual use of PETC-I training will not be determined until followup can be made at a later date.

Methods of Tracking Additional Product Sales. One evaluation question sought hard data on the success of the dissemination strategy.

To what degree are products sold?

The design called for communication with Commercial Educational Distributing Services, publishers of GPS training materials, to ascertain sales resulting from the PETC-I training in Florida. No instruments were developed for this query. This information was complemented by data collected during the follow-up interviews with the workshop participants.

Results Concerning Product Sales. At the time of this writing, a total of 43 sets of GPS training materials had been sold for the Florida TEC's GPS workshops. No materials had been sold to IGE but that was to be expected as this report was written only two weeks after the initial training.

Characteristics of Training

To determine some of the variables that might influence the feasibility of this dissemination strategy the following methods were used and the following results were obtained concerning characteristics of training.

Methods of Studying Rationale. One evaluation question was concerned with the rationale for delivering PETC-I training in the implementation of this dissemination strategy.

What is the rationale behind training format, selection of products used, and time allocation?

Information pertaining to this question was obtained from FRDWU staff throughout the implementation of this dissemination strategy by means of informal interviews. At the conclusion of the PETC-I workshop, FRDWU trainers provided further information on training format and time allocation issues by responding to the Workshop Trainer Questionnaire (Appendix G), a four-item open-ended instrument. It included questions

concerning deviations made from the established PETC-I training strategies and the rationale for these departures.

Results Concerning Rationale. A highly-structured, experience-based training format is basic to most of the ITCP instructional systems. A principal rationale for this design is to provide training systems in which the major learnings are contained in the materials and in the systematic process, thus minimizing trainee dependency on trainer expertise. With the burden of learning responsibility placed on the trainee rather than the trainer, these ITCP training systems lend themselves to "turn-around training" in which participation in a workshop allows one to immediately deliver that training to others without further technical assistance or training.

Four ITCP training packages were initially considered for use in this study: Interpersonal Communications (IPC), Research Utilizing Problem Solving (RUPS), Interpersonal Influence (INF) and Preparing Educational Training Consultants-I (PETC-I). When the plans for this dissemination study were first shared with the TEC and IGE directors decisions had not yet been made on which system or systems to offer. Although each of the four systems would have provided a training resource for the TEC and IGE, the directors in both networks believed that the PETC-I training would provide them with a greater range of training skills and resources, allowing for greater flexibility in providing training to the varied target populations.

There is an established set and sequence of training strategies for the PETC-I system. However, three major departures from the strategies were made during the TEC training due to the nature of the trainee group, its experience and its purpose. They were:

1) Major extension of the time allotted for working with a force field analysis in session 4

2) Elimination of sessions 8 and 9 in which senior trainers model the skills trainer role by conducting two GPS sessions

3) Major modification in the session for trainee planning of their GPS workshop (session 18)

Further description of these deviations and the rationale for them is provided in the following discussion.

The senior trainers at the Florida PETC-I workshop deemed it advisable to give greater time and emphasis to the force field analysis session because the force field analysis is the cornerstone of the first 1½ days of needs assessment in a GPS workshop. The appropriateness of skills exercise selection and the success of the GPS workshop as a satisfactory training experience can depend on how well the skills trainer is able to manage the force field analysis activities.

The PETC-I strategies provide four sessions for skills trainer teams to present a GPS exercise to their fellow workshop members. However, the number of participants and TEC's involved in the training had resulted in the creation of six training teams. The senior trainers considered it more important that each training team have an opportunity to train an exercise and receive feedback than for them to observe the senior trainers conducting two GPS exercises to model the skills trainer role. For that matter, the senior trainers had been modeling the managing of an ITCP training experience throughout the workshop. Thus, the time allotted in sessions 8 and 9 for senior trainers conducting GPS exercise was given over to the additional two training teams.

The modification of the skills trainer team planning period in session 18 was the most major departure from the established PETC-I strategies. Ordinarily, trainees conduct a 5-day GPS workshop the week following completion of their PETC-I training and the skills trainer

teams use this 6-8 hour planning session to assign tasks amongst the members, obtain the necessary training materials, prepare the necessary newsprint charts, read concept papers, take part in some team-building activities, and perhaps practice their trainer role with their team members. The TEC trainees did not have this immediate task before them. In fact since many of these skills trainer teams did not plan to return to their TEC's and provide a conventional GPS workshop at all, they better used this time, with the presence of the senior trainers to lend technical assistance, to work on plans for alternative ways of delivering GPS training in the context of their TEC's program and needs. With this latter factor in mind, the senior trainers redesigned session 18 to include:

1). A brainstorming activity as a warm-up to thinking about alternative uses of the GPS training

2) A team planning period during which teams would produce a set of plans including:

- a clear goal statement
- a list of events that need to be promoted and carried out to achieve the goal
- task analysis essential for realization of events
- time line for accomplishing tasks

3) Presentation of team plans for total group reaction

The timing for this session was shortened accordingly, taking only one afternoon.

Methods for Ascertaining Achievement of Training Objectives

The success with which the training objectives were achieved was the domain of the following evaluation question:

> To what degree are the objectives for the sessions accomplished?

The design called for measuring perceptions of workshop participants

on the accomplishment of the objectives by having them respond to an item on the Post Session Questionnaire that read:

> How successful do you feel the workshop was in achieving its overall objectives?
>
> | Extremely Successful | Quite Successful | Only slightly Successful | Not at all Successful |
> |---|---|---|---|
> | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Results Concerning Achievement of Workshop Objectives.

Table 9

Participant Perception of Success of Objectives Accomplishment

Item	TEC N=14 Frequency	TEC N=14 Cumulative Percent	IGE N=12 Frequency	IGE N=12 Cumulative Percent
How successful do you feel the workshop was in achieving its overall objectives?				
Extremely successful	4	29	5	40
Quite successful	9	93	7	100
Only slightly successful	1	100	0	100
Not at all successful	0	100	0	100

As can bee seen from the data included in Table 9, the participants perceived a quite high rate of success in the achievement of the PETC-I objectives. Ninety-three percent of the TEC participants and 100 percent of IGE participants described the workshop as "extremely" or "quite" successful.

Methods for Studying Workshop Presentation. One evaluation question addressed itself to the effectiveness of the presentation of the training.

> To what degree are the sessions well organized and delivery effective?

Data were collected in response to this question by an onsite evaluator observing the PETC-I training only at the TEC site. Use of a Workshop Trainer Observation Sheet (Appendix H) and informal observations were the means of data collection. The Workshop Trainer Observation Sheet focuses the observer's attention on clarity of presentation, trainer attitude towards and handling of training materials and the relationship between trainers and workshop participants. Trainers were rated using this instrument during three randomly selected sessions over the course of the TEC workshop. In lieu of an observer at the IGE workshop, participants were asked questions on the Post-Workshop Questionnaire (Appendix I) to elicit their impressions of the workshop's quality.

Results About TEC Workshop Presentation. In all three observations the observer rated the trainer's presentations positively in terms of clarity of instructions, clarity of content, smoothness of handling materials, valuing materials, rapport with participants, and allowing autonomy to participants. At no time did the observer record any unfavorable impressions of the workshop nor any information about deviations from the instructional system's strategies and materials.

Results of IGE Workshop Presentation. The responses of participants to the questionnaire items are presented in Table 10. The number of respondents to various items is different because not every participant was asked every question. With every question, however, it is obvious that participants viewed the workshop as valuable and useful.

Table 10

Participant Perceptions of IGE Workshop

Item	Response	
1. Of what value do you think this workshop experience will be to you in your professional life in the future? (N-12)	Extremely valuable Quite valuable Somewhat valuable Of no value at all	4 7
2. Would you recommend this workshop to a good friend whose interests are like yours? (N=12)	Definitely recommend Probably recommend Probably not recommend Definitely not recommend	7 5
3. How much do you plan to use the ideas, skills and materials presented in this workshop in your work? (N=6)	Extensively Often Rarely Not at all	3 3
4. How successful do you feel the workshop was in achieving its overall objectives? (N=12)	Extremely successful Quite successful Only slightly successful Not at all successful	5 7
5. Now that the workshop is over, how would you sum up the experience? (N=12)	Extremely worthwhile Very worthwhile Somewhat worthwhile Of no worth at all	5 7
6. On the questionnaire that you filled out on the first day you gave your expectations for the workshop. Recalling them, how successful was this workshop in fulfilling the expectations you had for it? (N=12)	Extremely successful Quite successful Slightly successful Not at all successful	5 5 2
7. How clear were you on the workshop's overall objectives? (N=6)	Very clear Mostly clear Mostly unclear Very unclear	1 3 2
8. How useful do you think the skills and concepts you have learned will be in your work situation? (N=6)	Extremely useful Very useful Somewhat useful Of absolutely no use	3 1 2

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this final section the methods of the evaluation are briefly reviewed, results of the evaluation are applied to the evaluation questions in the form of conclusions and these conclusions are discussed. The chapter also includes recommendations to the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit based on these conclusions.

Review of Evaluation Methods

In order to evaluate the dissemination strategy considered in this report, a collaborative relationship was established between the FRDWU and two networks responsible for providing staff development and training for teachers: the Florida Teacher Education Centers (TEC's) and the Midwest Institute for Individually Guided Instruction (IGE). PETC-I training was delivered to selected TEC members in August, 1976 and to IGE facilitators in October, 1976.

The evaluation study had two principal foci:

1) To provide information on the feasibility of the strategy based upon initial implementation efforts

2) To gain an understanding of the factors influencing the feasibility of this strategy.

The first focus was concerned with the evaluation of the strategy's implementation and how well the dissemination objectives were then achieved. Descriptions and judgments regarding the former concern were obtained by the following means: 1) review of written documentation, 2) interviews with the FRDWU staff, 3) a questionnaire for the TEC and IGE directors at the time of the PETC-I training and 4) follow-up interviews with TEC and IGE directors. Information pertaining to the achievement of the dissemination objectives was gathered primarily from the participants. Due to the short length of time between the training

and the writing of this report, evaluation questions concerned with the use of the PETC-I training and other ITCP products in TEC and IGE schools and further training received by the participants, are addressed in terms of participant intentions to receive and give training rather than actual use. A post-session questionnaire, administered immediately following the PETC-I training, collected data on participant intentions to use their training and receive further training. Plans to deliver GPS training developed during the PETC-I workshop by TEC teams were another source of information. Follow-up interviews with TEC participants two months after the PETC-I training provided partial information on progress of training intentions. The previously mentioned follow-up interviews with the TEC directors also gathered information on their plans for using the ITCP training and products in their area.

The second focus of this evaluation study essentially dealt with the characteristics of the training and the success of the PETC-I workshop as a training entity. Three means of data collection were applied: 1) interviews with the FRDWU senior trainers of the PETC-I workshops, 2) an evaluator-observor, who was present at three TEC training sessions and who made judgments as to the overall quality and the degree of deviation from established procedures and 3) a post-workshop questionnaire that requested participant perceptions of the quality of training received.

Conclusions and Recommendations

It is apparent that the collaborative relationship of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory with the Florida Teacher Education Centers and the Midwest Institute for Individually Guided Education were satisfying; all the parties involved expressed a desire to continue pursuing such relationships in the future. It also appears that the

dissemination objectives established for this study were in process of being accomplished: as this report was written Group Process Skills workshops were being conducted in three of the six TEC areas and plans for further use of the PETC-I materials and other ITCP training systems were being developed and implemented in four of the six TEC areas.

There are, however, issues and concerns identified by the various participants in this endeavor that deserve attention in future efforts to implement such dissemination strategies. With these issues in mind, the following conclusions and recommendations are presented for the consideration of the developers of this dissemination strategy, the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit, and other interested persons.

There appear to be several factors that are critical to the development of a satisfactory and productive collaborative relationship. Of primary importance is personal contact between the collaborating parties. The vast geographical distance of Oregon from Florida and Wisconsin accentuated the impact of the personal contact since the presence of FRDWU staff in Florida and Wisconsin emphasized their interest in the project and humanized the relationship.

Another factor was the complexity of relationships resulting from the multi-party nature of the TEC and IGE directors as client; its effect on planning logistics and developing a unified effort was significant and may have potentially an adverse effect on such a collaborative relationship if the parties involved are unaware of its potential effects.

Prior relationships with influential persons in the area which would be clients live appears to ease the entry process of the disseminator and aid in establishing credibility for products. The FRDWU staff perceived their relationship of several years with the Director of

Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Florida School of Education to be a great boon in establishing their relationship with TEC directors. The same type of long-term relationship was perceived as important in the IGE network. Further study of the effect of prior relationships on such collaborative arrangements needs to be undertaken to obtain a better understanding of its significance.

As for the realization of dissemination objectives, there appear to be two crucial and somewhat interrelated factors: 1) the amount of involvement of key influential people of the client group in the implementation of the dissemination strategy and 2) the appropriateness of expectations on the part of clients. In two of the three TEC's where the GPS training was actually being carried out, the TEC director had followed-up his responsibility for recruiting PETC-I trainees participating in the training himself, but in the three TEC's where training plans had not yet been realized, the TEC directors were not PETC-I participants. This evidence suggests that the success of a dissemination strategy such as the one used in the Florida TEC network may reside in having the key influential people in the dissemination area participate fully in the implementation of that strategy.

The degree of involvement of the TEC directors had its affect also on the appropriate setting of expectations in the PETC-I participants and there is an apparent corollation between appropriate expectations being set and one measure of success of this dissemination strategy; i.e., the conducting of a GPS workshop. Two of the TEC directors failed to send participant lists to the FRDWU staff prior to the PETC-I training. As a result PETC-I participants from those two centers did not receive background information about the PETC-I workshop and were unaware of their TEC's commitment to having them train a GPS workshop

this fall. Of the six TEC's involved in the PETC-I training, it is only at these two centers that plans for training a GPS workshop have either not been made at all or have been tabled indefinitely. Although there are, of course, other factors involved in the present failure of these two centers to honor their commitment to deliver GPS training in their area, the relationship of appropriate expectation setting and delivering of GPS training is suggestive.

As regards these two factors in the success of the dissemination strategy, the evaluation does not provide specific recommendations. However, it does seem obvious that disseminating strategies in the future ought to take into account the possible deleterious effects which these factors may have on their success.

One comment should be made about the nature of the PETC-I training and the deviations that were made in the Florida workshop. The planning session for skills training teams to prepare for their GPS workshops was modified to have the teams consider alternative ways in which their PETC-I training might be used. The rationale for this modification was that the TEC's provided highly varying contexts and needs and that the training teams may find themselves wanting to adapt the GPS training materials to more directly meet these needs and conditions. The validity of this rationale is receiving support from the GPS training that has thus far resulted from the Florida PETC-I workshop. All three GPS workshops that have been or will soon be initiated in Florida have not completely followed the established strategies for delivery, and in one case, content. Along the same vein, the Directors of the IGE Institute reported the primary inhibiting factor in recruiting participants was the long-term requirements for training in NWREL instructional systems. The FRDWU may wish to explore the need to create some flexibility in

the now rigidly structured ITCP training systems so that the training packages will be optimally responsive to client needs in future dissemination efforts.

Appendix A:

Activity Report Form

UNIT _____

Activity Report Form

Person Reporting _____ Date_____

Other(s) involved in activity _____

_____

Time consumed in activity_____

Events that led up to activity including all preparation and time spent:

Purpose of activity (include who initiated and why):

Description of activity:

Context: phone ____ face-to-face ____ writing ____ hosting ____ visiting ___

Mode: oral ____ print ____ artwork____ audio/visual ____

Information delivered:

Information received:

Plans for followup events and decisions made:

Appendix B:

Followup Letter re Agreements
Between ITCP and TECs

Marilyn Rieff and I wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity to talk with you about collaborating with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) in a joint effort to train a team from your teacher center in one of our training systems.

We were pleased with your willingness to cooperate with us to study the process of delivering a validated training program from an educational laboratory directly to local educators as quickly as possible. We see this as a significant study which will be mutually beneficial.

A number of agreements were reached at our meeting in Bartow. A summary of our understanding of these agreements is:

THE NORTHWEST REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY AGREES TO:

- provide the training for Week 1, Preparing Educational Training Consultants I: Skills Trainers, for teams of 3-4 from each of the eight teacher centers in South Florida

- provide refreshments at the workshop site

- share with teacher center directors the evaluation design for this study as soon as it is completed (hopefully at the teacher directors meeting in April).

EACH TEACHER CENTER AGREES TO:

- select their team of 3-4 participants

  We did not provide explicit recommendations for your consideration in the selection of participants for this workshop. However, we have found the following guidelines important for maximizing the effects of the training. It is recommended that participants be selected who:

  - are committed to process training

  - volunteer for the training experience

  - agree to conduct a workshop as offered through the teacher center

- have time or can get release time to conduct the training

- welcome the opportunity to gain trainer skills in process training

- have credibility with other educators and would be received as an acceptable trainer

Teacher center directors and/or staff members are encouraged to participate in this training. Such participation could constitute a 4th or 5th representative from a teacher center.

- pay the expenses of their team of participants (NWREL will be responsible for getting materials to the workshop site)

The material cost for each participant is:

PETC I participant materials	$ 7.85
Looseleaf notebook of exercises and handouts.....	31.00
GPS Trainer's Manual.....	6.80
	$45.65

(the notebook of exercises and handouts along with the GPS Trainer's Manual are nonconsumable items).

- offer a Group Process Skills (GPS) workshop in late summer or early fall to be trained by workshop participants

We also agreed that the PETC I workshop would be conducted during the week of August 2-7 at the Pinellas County Teacher Center at Largo.

If any of the above is not consistent with your understanding, please call us collect (503/248-6868 or 6869) immediately so that appropriate steps can be taken to reach a shared understanding. In fact, we welcome a collect call from you any time you have questions or concerns that need to be clarified. (Remember that we are on Pacific Standard Time which is a three-hour time difference from Florida; Portland is three hours behind you).

We look forward to working with you and will be in touch in the near future.

Sincerely,

William T. Ward
Coordinator
Office of Field Relations
and Dissemination
Improving Teaching Competencies
Program

WTW:jb

Appendix C:

Workshop Coordinator Interview Guide

Workshop Coordinator Interview Guide

Program 100 - IGE Directors

(These are general questions that the interviewer should ask of each IGE Director involved in the Wisconsin workshop. The interviewer should pursue specifics as needed.)

We are interested in obtaining some additional information regarding the PETC-I workshop in which you recently participated. This information will help us in planning future workshops.

1. What is your understanding of the objectives of the PETC-I training program?

2. What target groups (or issues) do you have in your IGE area for which you believe the PETC training can be used?

3. How do you intend to use the PETC training resources?

4. We would like to know more about your reasons for choosing the people who you recruited for the workshop. How did you decide to ask the people who you did? For example, did they meet certain criteria? Did you know of their interests in this type of training? Were they simply convenient, or what?

5. If you asked some people who chose not to participate, what was their reason for declining your invitation?

6. Since the PETC-I workshop, have you done anything to try to set up another PETC-I or similar Lab workshop (other than the agreed upon GPS workshops)? If so, what?

   Do you plan to set up another workshop?

7. In regard to the last PETC-I workshop, were there any costs for it to your TEC? Would your TEC be willing to bear any expenses for further workshops by the Lab? (Probe: why, yes or no; what types of costs?)

8. Now that the PETC-I workshop is over, do you plan to do anything to maintain a relationship with the Lab in the future? If so, what?

9. Would you actively seek other collaborative arrangements such as the one you had with NWREL, i.e., an arrangement in which you aid an outside organization in providing new resources for your IGE program?

10. Thinking back on the evolution of your relationship with NWREL in preparation for this PETC-I workshop, what do you see as being helpful factors in building this relationship?

Thank you for your time.

Appendix D:

Participant Background Information Sheets

PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET

INDIVIDUALLY GUIDED EDUCATION WORKSHOP

(Form A)

Sex: Male_____ Female_____

Age: __Under 30 __30-40

__41-50 __Over 50

1. What is your current occupation or job position?_____

_____

2. How many years of previous work experience in education have you had?

_____

3. Describe below any workshops or courses you have had in interpersonal communication and influence, problem-solving, group dynamics, human relations, sensitivity training, encounter groups, or interaction analysis.

Course or Workshop Description	Length (Days or Hours)	Year Taken

4. Please describe your main reason for attending the workshop (e.g., to get needed credits, superior suggested it, special interest in the topic, relevance to work situation, others):

5. What topics do you expect to be covered at this workshop?

6. What do you expect to gain as a result?

7. What led you to your expectations of the workshop content and personal benefits?

As part of our evaluation work, we will want to maintain contact with you to determine your use of the materials obtained during this workshop. In the space below, please give us your name and the address which we should use in contacting you.

Name_____

Address_____(Home__, School__, Other__)

City_____State_____Zip_____

PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET

Teacher Education Center Workshop
(Form B)

Sex: Male____ Female____

Age: __Under 30 __30-40

__41-50 __Over 50

1. What is your current occupation or job position?_____

_____

2. How many years of previous work experience in education have you had?

_____

3. What is your educational background?

__Some college (major field of study)_____

__College graduate (major field of study)_____

__Graduate student (major field of study)_____

__Advanced degree(s) (major field of study)_____

4. Describe below any workshops or courses you have had in interpersonal communication and influence, problem-solving, group dynamics, human relations, sensitivity training, encounter groups, or interaction analysis.

Course or workshop Description	Length (days or hours)	Year Taken

PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET
Teacher Education Center Workshop
Form B - Page 2

5. What topics do you expect to be covered at this workshop?

6. What do you expect to gain as a result?

7. What led you to your expectations of the workshop content and personal benefits?

As part of our evaluation work, we will want to maintain contact with you to determine your use of the materials obtained during this workshop. In the space below, please give us your name and the address which we should use in contacting you.

Name_____

Address_____(Home__, School__, Other__)

City_____State_____Zip_____

PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET

Teacher Education Center Workshop
(Form C)

Sex: Male____ Female____

Age: __Under 30 __30-40

__41-50 __Over 50

1. What is your current occupation or job position?_____

_____

2. What is your educational background?

__Some college (major field of study)_____

__College graduate (major field of study)_____

__Graduate student (major field of study)_____

__Advanced degree(s) (major field of study)_____

3. Please describe your main reasons for attending the workshop (e.g., to get needed credits, superior suggested it, special interest in the topic, relevance to work situation, others):

4. What topics do you expect to be covered at this workshop?

PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET
Teacher Education Center Workshop
Form C - Page 2

5. What do you expect to gain as a result?

6. What led you to your expectations of the workshop content and personal benefits?

7. Does your attendance at this workshop contribute towards:

Yes	No	
_____	_____	State certification
_____	_____	Credit toward academic degree(s)
_____	_____	School district tenure
_____	_____	Salary schedule criteria
_____	_____	Other (explain)_____
		_____

As part of our evaluation work, we will want to maintain contact with you to determine your use of the materials obtained during this workshop. In the space below, please give us your name and the address which we should use in contacting you.

Name_____

Address_____(Home__, School__, Other__)

City_____State_____Zip_____

Appendix E:

Workshop Organizer Questionnaire

WORKSHOP ORGANIZER QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher Education Center Workshop

Name_____

Sex: Male_____ Female_____

Date of Workshop_____

Directions: The purpose of this questionnaire is to gain information about your experience in setting up the PETC-I workshop. We plan to use this information to help others in similar positions in organizing workshops. The information that you give us will be kept secure; only summaries from all workshop organizers will be reported.

Please answer all questions given below. Any additional comments that you would like to give about experiences in organizing this workshop will be welcomed.

Thank you for your assistance.

1. How many years of previous work experience in education have you had?

_____

2. What is your current occupation or job position?_____

_____

3. How long have you been in your present position? _____

4. About how many people in each of the following groups are in your service area? How many of each did you contact?

No. in Service Area	No. of People Contacted	
_____	_____	Teachers
_____	_____	Principals
_____	_____	District or State Office Personnel
_____	_____	Other (please specify)_____
		_____

b. If not all people in these groups in your service area were contacted, please explain who was excluded and why.

c. What recruitment procedures did you use for each group? (Check as many as apply for each group).

	Teachers	Principals	District/State Office Pers.	Other
Phone calls to each individual				
Group presentations				
Mailed printed materials				
Printed materials distributed through school delivery system				
Other				

Please describe any other procedures used:

d. What materials, if any, did you use in recruiting participants?

_____No materials were used

_____Brochures and materials prepared by NWREL

_____Brochures and materials prepared jointly with other Florida Teacher Education Centers

_____Brochures and materials prepared by this Teacher Education Center

_____Other (please describe)_____

_____

e. Which recruitment procedures were most successful and why?

f. Which procedures were not successful and why?

5. We would like to know how much of your time was required to recruit and organize for this workshop.

a. When did you begin preparations (recruitment and organization) for this workshop?

b. About how much time (hours/weeks) have you spent since then in preparing for the workshop?

6. What special resources (e.g., mailing lists) of the Teacher Education Centers did you have to use in organizing the workshop?

7. Have you ever organized this workshop program before?

_____Yes If so, how many times?_____

_____No

8. Have you ever organized other similar workshop programs (e.g., other group process or interpersonal skill workshops)?

_____Yes

_____No

9. Have you ever been a participant in this workshop program?

_____Yes

_____No

10. Have you ever been a participant in any other similar workshop programs?

_____Yes

_____No

11. What suggestions can you make for organizing future workshops of this nature?

12. Do you plan to organize this or other NWREL workshops again in the future?

_____Yes

_____No

_____Uncertain

13. Are any special requirements or resources (e.g., financial support from an external source, free materials, collaboration with other TECs) necessary in order for your Teacher Education Center to participate in other NWREL workshops in the future? If financial assistance is required, for what (e.g., participant travel, materials, etc.) would it be used?

Please return this questionnaire to NWREL staff at the workshop or mail to:

David Green
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S. W. Second Avenue/Lindsay Building
Portland, Oregon 97204

Appendix F:

Participant Interview Guide

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

We would like to find out about any training that you or your team members have done since the PETC-I workshop. This information will help us learn how much the training is being used.

1. Have you or your team members conducted the GPS training that you were planning to do following the PETC-I workshop?

   a. If so, where was it held and how many participants were there? How successful was your GPS workshop? Do you plan to hold additional GPS workshops?

   b. <u>If not</u>, do you plan to conduct a GPS workshop? When will it be?

2. Have you used the materials that you received at the workshop for any other purpose? If so, what?

Thank you for your time.

Appendix G:

Workshop Trainer Questionnaire

WORKSHOP TRAINER QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher Education Centers

Trainer Name_____

1. What is the degree to which participants in this workshop were similar or different from other groups you have trained?

2. Other than the changes you made for the last one-and-a-half days, what adjustments or deviations did you make in the regular sessions? What was the reason for the changes?

3. Aside from the activities for the last one-and-a-half days did you emphasize dissemination of materials more than you have in past workshops? If yes, please explain.

4. Describe the activities that you conducted during the last one-and-a-half days of the workshop. Please outline the activities and give the purpose for each.

Appendix H:

Workshop Trainer Observation Sheet

WORKSHOP TRAINER OBSERVATION SHEET

(Rate trainers during three randomly selected regular sessions)

Date:_____ Trainer:_____

Session No.:_____ Observer:_____

1. How clearly did the workshop trainer present the task instructions?

   Very Clear /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Very Unclear

2. How clearly did the workshop trainer present any content? (e.g., rationale, introduction, subject matter, etc.)

   Very Clear /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Very Unclear

3. Did the matter of participant expectations come up during this session?

   _____Yes _____No

4. How did the workshop trainer deal with it?

5. How did the workshop trainer handle the materials?

   Very Poorly, Seemed Confused /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Very Well, Went Smoothly

6. What was the workshop trainer's attitude towards the materials?

   Seemed to Value and Enjoy Them /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Seemed to Devalue and Dislike Them

7. What was the general feeling tone between the workshop trainer and the workshop participant?

   No Rapport, Bad Feelings and Tension /___/___/___/___/___/___/ Good Rapport, Excellent Goodwill

8. To what extent did the trainer allow participants to carry out the exercises for themselves?

Stayed Out of Work Groups Entirely	/ / / / / / /	Extremely Involved in Work Groups

9. Please use the appropriate procedure checklist for this session and note wherever the trainer deviates from the standard procedure; also note the nature of the deviations, if any.

7/76

Appendix I:

Post-Workshop Questionnaire

POST SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE

INDIVIDUALLY GUIDED EDUCATION WORKSHOP
(Form A)

Name_____

I. The following questions deal with how you feel about the usefulness of the workshop and learnings, for yourself and for others.

1. How useful do you think the skills and concepts you have learned will be in your work situation?

Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Of Absolutely No Use
4	3	2	1

Comments:

2. Of what value do you think this workshop experience will be to you in your professional life in the future?

Of No Value At All	Somewhat Valuable	Quite Valuable	Extremely Valuable
1	2	3	4

Comments:

3. How much do you plan to use the ideas, skills and materials presented in this workshop in your work?

Extensively	Often	Rarely	Not At All
4	3	2	1

Comments:

4. Would you recommend this workshop to a good friend whose interests are like yours?

Definitely Recommend	Probably Recommend	Probably Not Recommend	Definitely Not Recommend
4	3	2	1

4. (continued) Comments:

II. In this section we are interested in your reaction to the workshop as a whole and its overall objectives.

1. How successful do you feel the workshop was in achieving its overall objectives?

Extremely Successful	Quite Successful	Only Slightly Successful	Not at All Successful
4	3	2	1

Comments:

2. Now that the workshop is over, how would you sum up the experience?

Extremely Worthwhile	Very Worthwhile	Somewhat Worthwhile	Of No Worth At All
4	3	2	1

Comments:

3. Did the information that your received before the workshop accurately represent the contents of the workshop?

_____Yes If not, how was it misleading:_____

_____No _____

4. How could publicity before the workshop have been improved?

_____

_____

5. On the questionnaire that you filled out on the first day you gave your expectations for the workshop. Recalling them, how successful was this workshop in fulfilling the expectations you had for it?

Not at All Successful	Slightly Successful	Quite Successful	Extremely Successful
1	2	3	4

III. In this section we would like to find out your plans for further use of the PETC-I materials.

1. How do you intend to use your PETC-I training?

_____ To conduct a GPS workshop

_____ Other _____

2. If you want to use the materials for training others, will you have to obtain persmission from anyone in your organization?

_____Yes If yes, what is that person's position in the organization?_____

_____No _____

3. If you wanted your organization or school to finance additional training for you or others, what would you have to do to secure that funding?

_____I could not influence such funding

_____I could authorize it myself

_____Make formal application to my superiors

_____Other (please specify)_____

_____

4. Do you feel attendance at this workshop <u>should</u> contribute to state certification, credit toward academic degrees, school district tenure, or salary schedule criteria?

_____Yes Which?_____

_____No _____

5. Would you like to receive additional training in other NWREL workshops?

_____Yes If yes, which ones?_____

_____No _____

POST SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher Education Center
(Form B)

Name_____

I. The following questions deal with how you feel about the usefulness of the workshop and learnings, for yourself and for others.

1. Of what value do you think this workshop experience will be to you in your professional life in the future?

Of No Value At All	Somewhat Valuable	Quite Valuable	Extremely Valuable
1	2	3	4

Comments:

2. Would you recommend this workshop to a good friend whose interests are like yours?

Definitely Recommend	Probably Recommend	Probably Not Recommend	Definitely Not Recommend
4	3	2	1

Comments:

II. In this section we are interested in your reaction to the workshop as a whole and its overall objectives.

1. How clear were you on the workshop's overall objectives?

Very Clear	Mostly Clear	Mostly Unclear	Very Unclear
4	3	2	1

Comments:

POST SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE
Teacher Education Center
Form B - Page 2

2. How successful do you feel the workshop was in achieving its overall objectives?

Extremely Successful	Quite Successful	Only Slightly Successful	Not at All Successful
4	3	2	1

Comments:

3. Were the workshop facilities conducive to effective training?

Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Of No Use
4	3	2	1

Comments:

4. Now that the workshop is over, how would you sum up the experience?

Extremely Worthwhile	Very Worthwhile	Somewhat Worthwhile	Of No Worth At All
4	3	2	1

Comments:

5. Did the information that you received before the workshop accurately represent the contents of the workshop?

_____Yes If not, how was it misleading?_____

_____No _____

6. How could publicity before the workshop have been improved?

_____

_____

7. On the questionnaire that you filled out on the first day you gave your expectations for the workshop. Recalling them, how successful was this workshop in fulfilling the expectations you had for it?

Not at All Successful	Slightly Successful	Quite Successful	Extremely Successful
1	2	3	4

III. In this section we would like to find out your plans for further use of the PETC-I materials.

1. In addition to the GPS session that will follow from th s workshop, do you intend to use the workshop materials to train others?

_____Yes If yes, please explain:_____

_____No _____

2. If you want to use the materials for training others, will you have to obtain permission from anyone in your organization?

_____Yes If yes, what is that person's position in the organization?_____

_____No _____

3. If you wanted your organization or school to finance additional training for you or others, what would you have to do to secure that funding?

_____I could not influence such funding

_____I could authorize it myself

_____Make formal application to my superiors

_____Other (please specify)_____

_____

4. Do you feel attendance at this workshop should contribute to state certification, credit toward academic degrees, school district tenure, or salary schedule criteria?

_____Yes Which?_____

_____No _____

5. Would you like to receive additional training in other NWREL workshops?

_____Yes If yes, which ones?_____

_____No _____

7/76

POST SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher Education Center
(Form C)

Name_____

I. The following questions deal with how you feel about the usefulness of the workshop and learnings, for yourself and for others.

1. How useful do you think the skills and concepts you have learned will be in your work situation?

Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Of Absolutely No Use
4	3	2	1

Comments:

2. How much do you plan to use the ideas, skills and materials presented in this workshop in your work?

Extensively	Often	Rarely	Not at All
4	3	2	1

Comments:

II. In this section we are interested in your reaction to the workshop as a whole and its overall objectives.

1. How clear were you on the workshop's overall objectives?

Very Clear	Mostly Clear	Mostly Unclear	Very Unclear
4	3	2	1

Comments:

2. Were the workshop facilities conducive to effective training?

Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Of No Use
4	3	2	1

Comments:

3. Did the information that you received before the workshop accurately represent the contents of the workshop?

_____Yes If not, how was it misleading?_____

_____No _____

4. How could publicity before the workshop have been improved?

_____

_____

5. On the questionnaire that you filled out on the first day you gave your expectations for the workshop. Recalling them, how successful was this workshop in fulfilling the expectations you had for it?

Not at All Successful	Slightly Successful	Quite Successful	Extremely Successful
1	2	3	4

III. In this section we would like to find out your plans for further use of the PETC-I materials.

1. In addition to the GPS session that will follow from this workshop, do you intend to use the workshop materials to train others?

_____Yes If yes, please explain:_____

_____No _____

2. If you want to use the materials for training others, will you have to obtain permission from anyone in your organization?

_____Yes If yes, what is that person's position in the organization?_____

_____No _____

3. If you wanted your organization or ~~school~~ to finance additional training for you or others, what would you have to do to secure that funding?

_____I could not influence such funding

_____I could authorize it myself

_____Make formal application to my superiors

_____Other (please specify)_____

_____

4. Do you feel attendance at this workshop <u>should</u> contribute to state certification, credit toward academic degrees, school district tenure, or salary schedule criteria?

_____Yes Which?_____

_____No _____

5. Would you like to receive additional training in other NWREL workshops?

_____Yes If yes, which ones?_____

_____No _____

7/76